

about the comprehensive lead program is that it pays to remove lead service lines. This seems like less but calling it comprehensive certainly suggests more.

In addition, this amendment authorizes \$4.5 billion per year for both programs. Does this mean \$4.44 billion is supposed to go to the new, undefined comprehensive program and \$60 million to the existing defined lead reduction program?

Are they supposed to be treated equally?

On the question of funding, the amount authorized to be spent in 1 year is 300 percent more than the entire amount of Federal funding for major drinking water aid programs. It is actually about one-half of the EPA's entire annual budget.

The regular lead reduction program which was authorized at \$60 million per year and took 4 years to establish is now just starting to award funds. Since the comprehensive program is a separate program, we can expect this program to take longer to get going, but in reality, pushing this unprecedented level of funding out the door might be aspirational rather than realistic. That would be a shame for those communities who need it most.

Second, the amendment waives any requirements for matching funds from the water systems or communities that obtain them. On top of that, this amendment waives any requirement for any person to pay for replacement of their personally-owned portion of lead service lines, whereas the existing program waives this expense for low-income people. This means people who have the financial resources to afford their own replacements don't have to use them at all because the new comprehensive program will pick up the check for them. That is not very progressive. Compensating the wealthy for these replacements both now and in the future is an especially harsh consequence for U.S. taxpayers, but that is what this amendment does.

Flint was a failure at all levels, and it happened because of money in politics. The city of Flint wanted off Detroit water because they felt they were being gouged on their rates.

The city council set an artificial political deadline for transition that wasn't based on the engineering needs of the system's water chemistry.

The State cut the city slack because the city was in receivership and didn't pursue enforcement.

EPA was aware of the high-level readings but minimized their impact to avoid causing a panic and slowed-walked the legal response.

The biggest problem was that no one told the public.

Flint suffered because of that, and the people living in the most neglected areas of Flint suffered the most.

So while this amendment guarantees priority funding for cities and water utilities for low-income folks, this amendment does not mandate that

these households get their lead service lines replaced first or that they target the worst contamination. Let me repeat that. Under this amendment, you can be the reason your city or utility gets moved to the front of the line, but that city does not have to replace the poorest and most dangerous lead service lines.

This is another example of why we shouldn't stick safe drinking water amendments on a transportation bill. It bastardizes the process and creates poor public policy like this amendment.

I ask for a "no" vote.

In fact, Chairman DEFAZIO in the Rules Committee once said: I have no idea what these amendments mean because I had no jurisdiction on this process.

So with that, Madam Speaker, vote "no" on this very poorly drafted amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of the Tlaib/Kildee/Slotkin/Cicilline/Moore amendment to help remove dangerous lead pipes in our communities.

Lead paint in housing and water infrastructure containing lead are the two primary, but not the sole, pathways for lead poisoning in our children.

HUD estimates that over 22 million homes (34 percent of the homes built before 1978) have significant lead-based paint hazards. Nationwide, estimates are that there are as many as 10 million lead service lines.

The pernicious impacts of lead poisoning are well known. These impacts are often lifelong and irreversible. Lead poisoning is a serious threat in the State of Wisconsin and particularly in the City of Milwaukee, which has the largest concentration of lead service lines in the state. And it's not just my state. According to the Great Lakes Governor's and Premiers, the Great Lakes region contains the highest concentrations of lead service lines in the United States.

The good news is that lead poisoning is preventable, not inevitable, if we act. It is critical that we start taking steps to boost assistance, especially to localities with extremely high numbers of households served by lead lateral lines, who are least able to pay for the replacement of those lines.

That's what this amendment does.

This amendment would authorize \$4.5 billion dollars per year for 5 years to help pay to fully replace lead service lines across the country with a priority given to low-income and other communities that suffer disproportionately from the harms posed by this threat.

A sustained substantial commitment to federal lead prevention and mitigation efforts is critical if our country is to make serious progress in protecting our nation's children. That's what this amendment does. It raises the federal investment and makes changes to ensure that more households can participate in comprehensive lead reduction projects that fully replace lead lines.

Unfortunately, the households most affected by this problem often have the fewest resources available to pay to replace lead pipes.

It reaffirms a federal commitment to helping get lead pipes out of the ground. Primary pre-

vention—the removal of lead hazards from the environment before a child is exposed—is the most effective way to ensure that children do not experience the harmful effects of lead exposure. These funds will help to ensure that children can grow up healthy and safe while living in homes where they are protected from lead poisoning.

For this small investment, our communities reap great gains. The annual costs of lead poisoning have been estimated at over \$50 billion. As noted in a report by the Pew Charitable Trusts, "In the absence of lead, hundreds of thousands of children would be more likely to realize their full potential thanks to higher GPAs, a better chance of earning high school diplomas and graduating.

This amendment gets us closer to riding our communities of lead service lines and to providing a healthier tomorrow for millions of children and their families. I urge my colleagues to support it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 2 is postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1342

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. WILD) at 1 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.

INVESTING IN A NEW VISION FOR THE ENVIRONMENT AND SURFACE TRANSPORTATION IN AMERICA ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2) to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF MISSOURI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on the